



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/633,876

08/04/2003

Ron L. Hale

0208.00060.01R

5253

37485 7590 07/07/2009
SWANSON & BRATSCHEUN, L.L.C
8210 SOUTHPARK TERRACE
LITTLETON, CO 80120

EXAMINER

HAGHIGHATIAN, MINA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/07/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

efspatents@sbiplaw.com

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendments and Remarks filed on 03/02/09 and an IDS filed on 04/01/09. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended and no claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims **1-28** remain pending.

Examiner's suggestion: Examiner suggests replacing the claim language of "less than about..." with "about... or less" in claims 1, 6, 16 and 24.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims **1-28** are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,090,830 in view of Byron et al (20040016427). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the examined claims would have been obvious over the reference claims. Here claims **1-28** are drawn to an article for use in an aerosol device for producing an aerosol comprising a substrate and a drug. The reference claims are drawn to a composition for delivery of a drug comprising a condensation aerosol wherein the drug is a heat stable drug. Byron et al teaches the device for heating and condensing active agents for inhalation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the article of Byron et al in the process of making the composition. In other words, the article for preparing the compositions of the instant claims would have been obvious over the compositions of U.S. Patent No. 7,090,830 in view of Byron et al.

Claims **1-28** are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of co-pending Application No. 10/633,877. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the examined claims would have been obvious over the reference claims. Here claims **1-28** are drawn to an article for use in an aerosol device for producing an aerosol comprising a substrate and a drug. The reference claims are drawn to a device for producing a condensation aerosol comprising a chamber, a substrate and a drug composition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 1616

the art to have implemented the article of the instant claims in the device of the reference claims for making the condensation aerosol composition. In other words, the article for preparing the compositions of the instant claims would have been obvious over the device of the reference claims. The drugs in both sets of claims are the same.

Claims **1-28** are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of co-pending Applications No. 10/437,643; 10/057,197 and 10/057,198. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the examined claims would have been obvious over the reference claims. Here claims **1-28** are drawn to an article for use in an aerosol device for producing an aerosol comprising a substrate and a drug. Claims of '643 are drawn to a condensation aerosol for delivery of a drug amine, the claims of '197 are drawn to a method of generating an aerosol and claims of '198 are drawn to a method of delivering an active compound in a form of a condensate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented the article of the instant claims in the methods and compositions of the reference claims. In other words, the article for preparing the compositions of the instant claims would have been obvious over the device of the reference claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 03/02/09, with respect to rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The said rejections have been withdrawn.

Applicant had stated that they agree to file Terminal Disclaimers to obviate the rejection of claims 1-28 under Obviousness-type Double patenting, once all other rejections have been withdrawn. The rejection of claims 1-28 under Obviousness-type Double patenting are the only remaining rejections of record. Accordingly, filing of Terminal Disclaimers are required to obviate the remaining rejections.

No claim is allowable.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1616

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINA HAGHIGHATIAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0615. The examiner can normally be reached on core office hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mina Haghighatian/

Mina Haghighatian
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1616